



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1017 Sparks

APPLICATION: CA3-21-095

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021, deferred since March 10, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: West of Lee Street and East of Peeples Street

Contributing (Y/N): No **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Minimal Traditional
Cottage cinder block house.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Additions and Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20, Chapter 20M of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

UPDATES in **Green**

UPDATES in RED

UPDATES for August 25 in BLUE

UPDATES for September 22 in Purple

PURVIEW

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The Compatibility rule will govern this body of work and read as such “where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure. Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be compatible with that which predominates in such like contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.”

Non-contributing Purview:

The existing house is non-contributing. The District regulations states that alterations to non-contributing structure shall be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the existing structure or shall comply with the applicable regulations for new construction.

DOCUMENTATION

An updated site plan is missing from the submission. Staff recommends the Applicant supply an updated site plan that reflects the setbacks and FAR or any site work anticipated because the elevations have changed.

The Applicant has proposed to construct a fence. The Applicant still needs to provide an updated site plan that will reflect the fence will not exceed the setback; a driveway that will not be more than 10 feet wide and extend 20 feet to the back; a required walkway and required sidewalk and the addition meeting the setback and FAR requirements.

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes an addition to the rear of the house on the left side to accommodate for a master suite. The floor plans indicate the addition will follow the existing house and will not extend beyond the sides. The Applicant proposes to raise the gable roof on the non-original addition to allow for the proposed addition. Staff doesn't find this problematic. This proposal permits a roofline that aligns with the existing in a coherent manner.

The Applicant has changed the proposed addition and an updated site plan will be needed. If the addition will continue to meet the setbacks and FAR, Staff finds the elevations (right side and left side proposal) depicting the roofline problematic. The proposed side elevations, show a gap between the existing roof line and the addition. However, the proposed roof plan does not show that there is a disconnection between the existing roofline and the addition. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify the intent of the roofline.

The Applicant has returned the proposed addition roof line back to what was originally proposed. The addition roof line tuck under the existing roof line. This proposed roof line is not problematic to Staff. The recess roofline that on the right elevation front is not problematic as well.

The Applicant has proposed the addition to be construction on a slab. This is problematic. Slab-construction is not permitted. Staff recommends for the foundation; the Applicant dig a crawl space for the addition.

The Applicant has updated the plans, to show a new crawl space to be built out. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The Applicant has indicated on the plans the siding to be a lap siding, however, the Applicant doesn't indicate what type of lap siding. Staff recommends the siding be horizontal smooth-faced and have a reveal between 4 to 6 inches to comply to the District regulations.

Windows

The Applicant proposes to add one two-over-two window with a divide on the front elevation and two two-over-two windows with lite divide on the east elevation. While the Applicant has not provided any compatibility information, research shows the predominate window is a one-over-one. Staff would recommend the Applicant comply and install one-over-one windows.

The Applicant has indicated one over one windows will be installed.

Foundation

On the plans the foundation appears to be a continuum of the proposed siding. This is prohibited. Staff recommends the foundation be concrete to match the foundation at the front of the house.

Staff cannot clearly determine what the foundation material will be on the proposed addition. This recommendation still stands.

The addition foundation will be concrete. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Dormer

The Applicant propose a dormer on the second level in the rear that will not be seen from the public-right-away. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ALTERATIONS

Roof and Porch

The Applicant has proposed to remove the existing small gable roof in the front and add a wider gable that will extend over a shed roof. Recognizing this is a non-contributing structure that should comply to the architectural style of the house or compatibility of the blockface, Staff is not concerned with a wider gable over the shed roof, however, Staff would recommend the gable does not extend over the entire shed roof. This reduction would comply with what is shown to be predominated on the block face and would not depart from the Minimal Traditional Cottage style that is current to the house.

The Applicant also proposes to extend the porch stoop. This would essentially take it from a stoop to a fuller porch. This is not problematic to Staff, many Minimal Traditional Cottage houses have stoops as well as porches.

The Applicant has shown a gable roof that is not wider and extend over the shed roof.

Fenestration, Windows, and Doors

Fenestration

The Applicant proposed to change the door to a window and a window to a door in the front façade to allow for a different entry into the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. The fenestration does not change but does allow for a better flow inside the house.

Windows

There are no photos of the existing windows, the Applicant has shown six-over-six windows on the existing plans. Yet, the Applicant has proposed two-over-two windows for the existing as well as the addition. As with the addition, Staff recommends the Applicant install one-over-one windows to comply with what is predominate on the blockface.

The Applicant has indicated one over one windows will be installed.

The window in the dormer is not necessary and isn't compatible with other dormers on the blockface. Staff recommends it is not installed.

The Applicant has indicated a vent would be installed instead of a window.

Door

The proposed door appears to be Craftsman door. Staff recommends the Applicant comply to the District regulations which states the door shall be a wood panel door or fixed glass panel in wood.

Staff cannot determine clearly what door is being proposed. There Staff's recommend of a door being wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood still stands.

The Applicant has shown a wood panel door.

Siding

The existing material for siding is cinder block. The Applicant has shown lap-siding. Staff notes, lap-siding is not required for the Applicant. However, if the Applicant wish to install lap-siding it must be horizontal and smooth-faced with a 4 to 6-inch reveal.

Chimney

There is no chimney on the house.

Walkway and Sidewalk

The Applicant has not provided a site plan to indicate the intention for a walkway and sidewalk. The District regulation requires both. Staff recommends the site plan reflect a walkway that is from the front sidewalk to the front entry of the principal structure. Additionally, the site plan should reflect a sidewalk that is between the planting strip and the required front yard and parallel to the

public street. It should be the same width as the sidewalk on abutting properties or it shall be the width otherwise required by city ordinance, whichever is greater. If no sidewalk exists in the block, the new sidewalk shall not be less than six-feet wide. The compatibility rule shall apply to sidewalks paving materials. If no sidewalk paving material predominates in the block, the sidewalk shall be constructed of the historically accurate material for that block, either hexagonal pavers, concrete inlaid with hexagonal imprint, or brick.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

1. An updated site plan shall be provided that reflect the fence, addition, driveway, walkway and sidewalk and setbacks and FAR information, per Sec. 16-20M.001;
2. The walkway shall be shown on the site plan and shown from the front sidewalk to the front entry, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(d)
3. A sidewalk shall be shown on the site plan and shown to be from the planting strip to and the front yard and parallel to the public street. It shall be the same width as the sidewalks on the abutting properties. If there are not sidewalks, it should be no less than 6 feet wide. Sidewalk material shall be determined by the compatibility standard and
4. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 794 Springdale Rd.

APPLICATION: CA2-21-406

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Druid Hills Landmark District

Other Zoning: N/A

Date of Construction: 1910

Property Location: West block face of Springdale Rd., north of the Ponce De Leon Ave. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Exhibits characteristics of French Eclectic Style architecture.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Roofing replacement

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20B

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CA2-21-406 for 794 Springdale Rd.

September 22, 2021

Page 2 of 2

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20B of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Roofing replacement in the District does not normally require a review by the Commission, unless the roofing material is different from the existing or historic material. As this structure would be transitioning from asphalt shingle to composite half barrel tile, the review by the Commission was triggered. In looking at the structure, it is clear that the existing shingle is not original to the structure. Staff further finds that the new material is not inconsistent with the style of the home. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed alteration.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1013 Sparks
APPLICATION: CA2-21-322
MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021 deferred since August 11, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1940's

of Arlington Avenue and East of Wilmington Avenue

Contributing (Y/N): No, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Minimal
traditional/duplex-double Shotgun

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N): Yes

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Applicant came before the Commission on July 28, 2021, when several conditions were listed to be met. Before that the property had a Staff Review in March 2021 for a 10ft driveway. July 2021, a Stop Work Order was placed to correct the 14 ft driveway and other authorized work on the property without a permit.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20, Chapter 20M of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

PURVIEW

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The Compatibility rule will govern this body of work and read as such “where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure. Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be compatible with that which predominates in such like contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.”

New Plans

The Applicant has provided new elevations for review.

PREVIOUS Concerns:

The following conditions will be reviewed on this review:

Driveway

The new site plan shows the proposed driveway is 14 ft and 5 inches wide. District regulations requires driveway to be 10 feet wide and have an extended 20 feet to the rear. Staff recommends the Applicant comply to the District regulations and construct a 10 feet wide with an extended 20 feet driveway.

Rear Projection

On the new elevations the Applicant has removed the projecting rear portion on the right-hand elevation. Staff is not concerned with this violation any longer.

Windows and Doors

District regulations requires, “replacement windows units shall maintain the size and shape of the original window opening.” The windows on the principal structure are boarded and the Applicant has removed the boards and replaced the windows with one-over-one vinyl windows. It appears most of the replacements have kept the same size, shape and original window openings with the exception of the following:

Front Elevation

On the front elevation the Applicant has covered a window and has converted an existing door into a window. Both are in violation of the District regulations. Staff recommends the Applicant return the original windows and size to comply to the District regulation. The front elevation the Applicant has open the space where a door once was. Style of doors are governed by the compatibility standard. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic evidence of doors on the blockface and install one that is predominate on the blockface.

Right Elevation

The revised plans, still show the rear window on the right-hand elevation has been converted from a window to a door. As stated, replacement windows must maintain the size and shape of the original window opening, converting to a door, would violate the District regulations. Staff recommends the Applicant return the window back to its originality and make sure the size and shape of the original window is adhered to. The middle window size has been changed. This too is a violation of the District regulation. Staff also recommends the window be returned to its' original size and shape and position.

Left Elevation

The Applicant has not indicated any proposed window change on the left elevation. For cautionary measures, Staff recommends if any windows on the left elevation have been altered in size shape or orientation, the Applicant must reinstall them back to their size and shape and original openings.

Roof

On the current gable roof, the eaves have been extended on the left and right sides of the houses. The front gable vent has been removed and shake has been installed in the gable. On the new submitted elevation, all of this is still being proposed; all are determined by the compatibility on the blockface. Extend eaves and shake in the gable is not a predominated feature on the blockface. Staff recommends the Applicant remove the extend eaves and install eaves that are predominated on the blockface, remove the shake and install vertical smooth cementitious siding with a 4 to 6 inch reveal to match what is predominate on the blockface. On the blockface, gable vents are prevalent. Staff recommends the Applicant install the gable vent that was there prior.

Porch Flooring

The original landing which could be constitute as porch flooring because at one time there was a shed roof over the area, has been installed as wood. District regulation states that "front porches shall contain roofs, balustrades, columns, steps, and other features as determined by the compatibility rule." Being that there was a shed roof that covered the flooring and research indicates the porch had balustrades and columns and the predominate porch flooring on the block face appears to be cement, not wood. Staff recommends the Applicant return the porch floor to cement and Staff also recommends the Applicant to install a shed roof with exposed roof rafters, columns, two-part railings with head butt construction with railings be no higher than the sill of the front window.

Walkway

The Applicant has installed a walkway on the right elevation that connects to the driveway. District regulations requires the walkway to extend from the sidewalk to the front door. Staff recommends the Applicant remove the walkway that is connected to the driveway on the right elevation. And install on according to the District regulations.

Sidewalk

Currently the Applicant has not indicated a sidewalk is proposed. However, the District regulations requires sidewalk be installed. District regulation states, "a sidewalk between the planting strip and the required front yard and parallel to the public street shall be provided." Currently there are no sidewalks on the blockface. District regulation states, "if no sidewalk exists in the block, the new sidewalk shall not be less than six-feet wide. The compatibility rule shall apply to sidewalks paving materials. If no sidewalk paving material on the block, the sidewalk shall be constructed of

September 22, 2021

the historically accurate material for that block, either hexagonal pavers, concrete inlaid with hexagonal imprint, or brick.” Staff recommends the Applicant comply to the District regulations and install a sidewalk, that is not less than six-feet wide, match the paving material that is historically accurate and dominate on the block either hexagonal pavers, concrete inlaid with hexagonal imprint or brick.

Address Wall

The new plans show an address wall has been installed at the front of the house. District regulations does not speak to address mailboxes. This is not a mailbox but a wall. Wall are not permitted at the beginning of property. Staff recommends the wall be removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

1. The driveway shall be 10 feet wide and extend 20 feet to the rear, per Sec. 16-20M.012(4)(c);
2. All altered windows on the principal structures shall comply to the District regulations and be returned back to their original size, shape and orientation (please see specifics in Staff report for which windows), per Sec. Sec.16-20M.013(o)(1);
3. The extended eaves on front left and right elevation and the shake in the gable roof shall be removed, per Sec. 16-20M.005;
4. The eaves shall match what is predominate of eaves reflected on the blockface, per Sec.16-20M.005;
5. The gable material shall be smooth-face cementitious siding with a 4-to-6-inch reveal to match what is predominate on the blockface, per Sec.16-20M.005;
6. The Applicant shall install a gable vent, per Sec.16-20M.005;
7. The porch flooring shall be cement not wood to be compatible with others houses on the blockface, per Sec.16-20M.005;
8. The porch shed roof, simple columns and a two-part head butt rail system that is no higher the sill of front window shall be reinstalled to make a complete porch required by the District regulation, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
9. The current walkway that is connected to driveway in the right elevation shall be removed, and a required walkway from the sidewalk to the front shall be installed per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(d);
10. A sidewalk shall be installed that is no less than 6-feet wide and have historically accurate paving material that is on the particular block: hexagonal pavers, concrete with inlaid hexagonal imprint or brick, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(c);
11. The address wall shall be removed, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(1)(2) and
12. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1028 Lawton Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-21-360
MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4A / Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West block face of Lawton Ave., south of the Peoples St. intersection

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Queen Anne

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, Deferred August 11, 2021. *Updated text in italics.*

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The subject property received a Stop Work Order on September 5, 2020 and May 25, 2021 for work without proper permits. Under that work, the front porch was removed, and other alterations were made to the structure. The current application is for the review of that illegal work.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20M of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Plans

No plans have been received as part of this application. Due to the structural work completed and still required relating to the front porch removal/replacement, , the proposed fence, and the installation of a rear deck, Staff finds that both elevations and a site plan will be required for this review. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide existing/proposed elevations and site plans.

The Applicant has provided updated plans which roughly depict the previously existing structure and porch. However, there are several proportional and drafting issues with the plans that make them problematic for use on this project. Firstly, the proportions of windows and doors to the wall surface area are off. Secondly, the porch roof is shown as a flat roof structure, whereas it was previously a shed roof. Lastly, the form and shape of the principal roof and building in general are not accurate to either the previous or as built conditions of the site. As such, Staff recommends the plans be redrawn to accurately reflect the proposed conditions of the site and the existing conditions of the structure.

Front porch replacement.

From the photographs provided, Staff finds that the front porch has been removed in its entirety. The porch contained a brick foundation that was roughly 6" above grade at the front façade, and short brick column bases that supported round turned columns containing an elaborate capital. The railing shown on the structure appears non-original to the home, and Staff finds the structure would likely not have had railing, or that the railing would have been between 2 feet to 3 feet tall at most. Above the porch was a compound shed roof that covered the front and wrap around portions of the porch. Staff finds that an accurate recreation of the front porch which was removed illegally would be required by the District regulations.

As such, Staff recommends the brick porch foundation and steps be repaired and reconstructed to the dimensions of the previous porch. Staff further recommends that a 1x4 to 1x6 tongue and groove material be used for both the porch floor and the porch ceiling. Staff further recommends that the columns be rebuilt to match the style, size, and dimensions of the original columns exactly. Staff further recommends that a porch roof matching the style, dimensions, and pitch of the previous compound shed roof be installed on the front porch. And lastly, Staff recommends that only the portions of the front porch on the left side of the wrap around area where railing would be required for life safety code contain railing that is constructed using a two part top rail, butt jointed balusters, and a bottom rail with kick-stops.

Windows and doors

The Applicant has provided photographs of the existing windows and doors with the exterior plywood coverings removed. Staff finds that the original doors and windows are missing. In looking at the photographic inventory, the windows were in place at the time of the District's designation in 2004. However, the update photos and publicly accessible street view photographs show the windows being boarded up between 2007 and 2008. No record of the windows or their condition exists between that 13 year period. Because of this, Staff has no evidence showing that the windows were in place before the work began. As such, Staff has no concern with replacing the windows but recommends that the new windows match the original window openings in size and placement.

Siding replacement

Based on the photographs provided by the Applicant and the Inspectors, Staff finds that the condition of the original wood siding on the structure is such that their repair and retention is possible. Staff only notes a few areas of broken siding laps that would require replacement of those individual pieces of siding. As such, Staff recommends all original siding on the front and sides of the structure be retained and repaired in-kind.

On the rear of the structure, it appears that a portion of the structure has been re-sided. From the photographs, Staff finds that only the left side façade of the work would be visible from the public right of way. As such, Staff recommends the left side of the rear portion of the structure which was re-sided be clad in horizontal lap siding.

Site work

The Applicant proposes a fence of an unknown height, construction, and location. Staff recommends the height, location, and materials of the proposed fence be provided on a site plan.

Staff has no general concerns with the design of the deck, but would recommend the Applicant document compliance with the Oakland City Historic District setback requirements by noting the location of the deck on a site plan.

While not mentioned in the plans, Staff finds that the existing front walkway is in need of replacement. In looking at both the extant physical remains of the walkway along with comparisons to historic walkways on the block face, Staff finds that the walkway was likely a hex-paver walkway. As such, Staff recommends the front walkway be replaced with a hexagonal paver walkway.

In the Past, the Commission has determined that when major alterations to a structure is preformed, that the requirement for a new sidewalk related to new construction projects would apply. As such, Staff recommends a new sidewalk be shown on the site plan and installed as part of this project.

Lastly, while the project does not note a driveway, Staff finds that it is likely one will be installed either as part of this project or in the future. As such, Staff recommends that any new driveway be no wider than 10 feet and extend a full 20 feet past the front façade of the structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. *The plans shall be redrawn to accurately reflect the proposed conditions of the site and the existing conditions of the structure;*
2. The brick porch foundation and steps shall be repaired and reconstructed to the dimensions of the previous porch, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1);
3. A 1x4 to 1x6 tongue and groove material shall be used for both the porch floor and the porch ceiling, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1);
4. The columns shall be rebuilt to match the style, size, and dimensions of the original columns exactly, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1);
5. A porch roof matching the style, dimensions, and pitch of the previous compound shed roof shall be installed on the front porch, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1);
6. Only the portions of the front porch on the left side of the wrap around area where railing would be required for life safety code shall contain railing that is constructed using a two-part top rail, butt jointed balusters, and a bottom rail with kick-stops, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1);
7. The new windows shall match the original window openings in size and placement, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1);
8. All original siding on the front and sides of the structure shall be retained and repaired in-kind, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1);
9. The left side of the rear portion of the structure which was re-sided shall be clad in horizontal lap siding, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1);
10. The height, location, and materials of the proposed fence shall be provided on a site plan, per Sec.

16-20M.017(1);

11. The Applicant shall document compliance with the Oakland City Historic District setback requirements by noting the location of the deck on a site plan, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1);
12. The front walkway shall be replaced with a hexagonal paver walkway, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1);
13. A new sidewalk shall be shown on the site plan and installed as part of this project, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1);
14. Any new driveway shall be no wider than 10 feet and shall extend a full 20 feet past the front façade of the structure, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1); and,
15. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2991 Layton
APPLICATION: CA2-21-397
MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021, deferred since September 8, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Whittier Mill Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4/A

Date of Construction: 1980

Property Location: Corner of Spade Avenue and Layton Avenue

Contributing (Y/N)? No, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Mill House

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20J

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: **Approval**

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Chapter 20 and Chapter 20J of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

Edits in RED

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The exterior work should be based on the compatibility which reads “the compatibility rule is a method of requiring that alterations and new construction are sensitive and sympathetic to existing elements of design, scale and general character of the district with particular attention to the immediate environment constituting a particular block. In accordance with this purpose, the compatibility rule is as follows: "To the maximum extent possible, the element in question, such as roof form or architectural trim, shall substantially match that which predominates on that block. When elements are quantifiable, such as building height or floor heights, they shall equal the statistical average of all like elements of all structures of like use in that block." Those elements to which the compatibility rule applies are specified in regulations by reference to "compatibility rule."”

DOCUMENTATION

The site plan that was provided by the Applicant do not give the required setbacks or FAR requirements. Staff recommends that Applicant provide a site plan that provides clear information of setbacks and FAR and place that information on the site plan.

The Applicant has provided an updated site plan that clearly shows the setbacks are being met including the roof is not violating the setbacks either. Staff is not concerned with this project.

ALTERATIONS

The Applicant proposes to add 215 sf roof to and existing 312 sf deck that sits at the rear of the existing house. However, the house sits on a corner lot so all sides of the house will be visible to the public. 245 sf will be covered and screened, and the remaining section will be uncovered and not screened. The deck board and railings are proposed to be replaced in-kind.

Roof

The rendering shows a slop roof that will tuck under the existing house roofline. Staff is not concerned with the construction of the roof; however, Staff need to verify the roof construction is meeting the setback in the rear and not exceeding it.

Alterations

The Applicant proposes to repair the deck floor and railings in-kind. Staff is not concerned with this proposal since this is a deck and not a porch.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 2957 Eleanor Terrace

APPLICATION: CA2-21-398

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1960's

Property Location: East of Woodmere and West of Eleanor Court

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Split-level ranch

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Painted Brick

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior work

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work was placed on property March 2021 for an express permit that never had a review by UDC. The Applicant has inherited the unpermitted work.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

COMPATIBILITY

“In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face."

The following unauthorized work has been done on the existing house in which the Applicant has inherited: Painted brick, siding replacement, possible window replacement, porch railings replacements and a door replacement.

ALTERATIONS

Painted Brick

Unpainted masonry is the District Regulations. Staff recommend the Applicant removes the paint from the masonry and to so in a manner that is not abrasive to masonry. Sandblasting is not permitted.

Siding

While the Applicant has not indicated siding proposal, research does show the siding on the front of the house has been changed to a knotted wood resembling shiplap. This not permitted. The original siding is horizontal lapsing which appear to be wood siding with a 4 to 6 reveal. Staff recommend the Applicant reinstall the correct siding to comply to the District regulations which states, “siding repair or replacement shall match the original in material, scale and direction.”

Windows

From the one photo, Staff cannot determine if the windows have absolutely been altered, while it does appear they have. District regulations requires that “architecturally significant windows and doors, including details, trim work, and framing, shall be retained.” Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic evidence showing the current installed windows so Staff can determine if the windows have been replaced and how.

Porch

The decorative iron columns have been removed and replaced. This is a violation of the District regulations. The iron columns are a distinctive character of houses built during this period. District regulation states, the intention of the regulations is “to ensure that new development is consistent with the historic character of the district.” The removal of the iron columns would remove this historic character. Staff recommends the columns be reinstalled to match the original columns so that the historic character will not be destroyed on the house.

Decorative Screen Door

As with the iron columns, the original decorative door screen was essential for the development during this time permit. Staff recommends, the decorative screen door be reinstalled to match the original.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20I of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall remove the paint from the masonry in a manner that is not abrasive to the masonry. No sandblasting is permitted, per Sec.16-20Q 001;
2. The Applicant shall reinstall siding that match the original in material, scale and direction to comply to the District regulations, per Sec/16-20Q 006.(3)(a)(6);
3. The Applicant shall install photographic evidence of the current windows, to determine if the windows have been replaced if so how, per Sec.16-20Q.006(3)(b)(1);
4. The porch columns shall be reinstalled to match the original iron columns, per Sec.16-20Q.001(5);
5. The screen door shall be reinstalled to match the original screen door, per Sec.16-20Q.001(5) and
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 871 White St.

APPLICATION: CA2-21-409

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A / Beltline

Date of Construction: 1935

Property Location: North block face of White St. between the Joseph E Lowery Blvd, and Lee St. intersections.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Craftsman Bungalow.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window Replacement

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20G of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Window Replacement

The Applicant is proposing the replacement of all windows on the property, including one non original window, and three windows that are not visible from the public right of way. The non-original window is labeled as window 9, and the non-visible windows are labeled as 10, 11, and 12 on the window inventory. Staff would note that the replacement of windows which are not visible from the public right of way does not require a review by the Commission but would require a Staff Review in order to confirm that the windows are not visible or not original to the structure, and that the proposed replacement material meets the District regulations.

The District regulations allow the replacement of original or historic windows only if the windows are beyond the point where repair is possible. The Applicant has submitted photographs of the windows on the structure along with a window inspection and testimony from a window specialist which confirms that the issues present on the windows are minor defects and that repair is possible. Staff would note that while the Applicant's presentation brings into question the financial cost of retention and repair of the minor defects on the windows, that the cost of compliance with zoning regulations is not considered when reviewing the feasibility of repairing historic windows. Further, the regulations do not require the retention of historic glass as part of the repair process. As such, Staff cannot approve wholesale replacement of the windows.

As such, Staff recommends that only windows labeled 9, 10, 11, and 12 on the window inventory marked received by the Office of Design on 09/14/2021 be replaced and that all other windows on the subject property be retained and repaired. Staff further recommends that the replacement window for the window labeled 9 be unclad wood with a 4 over 1 lite pattern matching the size, style, and dimensions of the original windows on the structure and that any simulated lite divisions meet the District regulations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. Only the windows labeled 9, 10, 11, and 12 on the window inventory marked received by the Office of Design on 09/14/2021 may be replaced, and all other windows on the subject property shall be retained and repaired per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
2. The replacement window for the window labeled 9 shall be unclad wood with a 4 over 1 lite pattern matching the size, style, and dimensions of the original windows on the structure and any simulated lite divisions shall meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(d) & (g); and,
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 3028 Baker Ridge

APPLICATION: CA2-21-411

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1960

Property Location: West of Kildare Avenue

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Ranch

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Porch railings

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior work

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: a Stop Work Order was placed on 3/30 for working without a permit.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

COMPATIBILITY

“In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face."

ALTERATION

Handrails

The Applicant proposes the existing porch railings be replaced. A photo provided by the Applicant shows the porch railings are rotten. District regulations states, “Replacement porches or stoops or their component features shall be permitted only when the original or historic porch or stoop or their component feature(s) cannot be rehabilitated. If the original or historic porch or stoops or their components cannot be rehabilitated, the replacement porch or stoop or their component features shall match the original in shape, size, internal proportions, and materials.” Staff recommends, the Applicant comply to the District regulations and replace the railings to match the existing in shape, size, internal proportions and material.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20I of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The replacement railings shall match the existing railings in shape, size, internal proportions and material per, Sec.16-20Q 006(10)(b)(c) and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 395 Glenwood Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-21-421
MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-5.

Date of Construction: 1890-1910

Property Location: Southeast corner of Glenwood Ave. and Oakland Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Victorian

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: foundation repair.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approve with conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20K of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant is proposing repairs to the existing foundation at the rear of the property. From the plans it appears that a support beam has been compromised which is causing issues with the foundation settling. Staff has no concerns with repairing the foundation walls, but recommends the Applicant detail what steps will be taken to ensure that the structure does not suffer further damage during the work. Staff further recommends that photographs of the rear of the structure showing the damage to the foundation be provided.

The plans also note repointing of the brick around the perimeter of the structure. Given the issues with using modern mortar on historic brick, Staff finds that special considerations must be made when selecting the mortar for the repointing. Staff recommends that the mortar used to repoint the foundation match the consistency and texture of the existing mortar.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall detail what steps will be taken to ensure that the structure does not suffer further damage during the work, per Sec. 16-20K.007(D);
2. Photographs of the rear of the structure showing the damage to the foundation shall be provided, per Sec. 16-20K.007(D);
3. The mortar used to repoint the foundation shall match the consistency and texture of the existing mortar, per Sec. 16-20K.007(D); and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 348, 360, 364, 368, & 378 Auburn Ave. NE, 349 & 385 Old Wheat St. NE

APPLICATION: CA3-21-427

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: MLK, Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 4)

Other Zoning: N/A

Date of Construction:

Property Location: North block face of Auburn Ave, south block face of Old Wheat St., between the Jackson St. and Hilliard St. intersections.

Contributing (Y/N)?:

Building Type / Architectural form/style:

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations, Additions, New construction.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20C

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20C of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Site Consolodation

Many of the proposed additions and structures would cross lot lines onto adjacent properties that are still associated with the project. Staff finds that consolidating the properties for the purposes of permitting would likely be the easiest way to simplify the permitting process, but that other methods may exist. If consolidation is proposed, Staff finds it would be best to include that work as part of the current project scope to avoid the need for multiple applications for one project. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information on the proposed lot configuration of the property and whether any consolidation of the lots is anticipated as part of this project.

Alterations to Historic Buildings

Historic Storefront Building Alterations

The Applicant is proposing several alterations to the storefront building located at 368 Auburn Ave. including the potential replacement of windows. As the storefront units are not original to the structure, Staff has no concerns if these unties are removed. However, Staff would recommend any window replacement on the historic storefront building located at 368 Auburn Ave. be reviewed and approved by Staff when replacement is deemed necessary by the project team.

The Applicant also proposes the repointing of brick on the storefront structures. Staff would recommend that mortar matching the consistency and color of the original be used for any repointing work on the historic storefront building located at 368 Auburn Ave.

Haugabrooks Funeral Home Alterations

The Applicant is proposing several alterations to the Haugabrooks Funeral Home building including the potential replacement of windows. Staff would recommend any window replacement on the Haugabrooks building located at 364 Auburn Ave. be reviewed and approved by Staff when replacement is deemed necessary by the project team.

Additions and New Construction

Compatibility Comparisons

The Applicant has provided documentation that the tallest historic structure on the block face has a height of 27' 10" taken from the average point of grade at the front façade to the top of the parapet wall. Staff finds that the method for measuring the structure meets the zoning requirements. The maximum height allowed by the zoning regulations for additions and new construction in this subarea is 1.5 times the height of the tallest historic structure on the block. Based on this information, the maximum height for new construction or additions on this block is 45' 1".

Information on material or fenestration compatibility has not been received. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the building materials and fenestration pattern of the comparable properties.

Historic Storefront Building Addition

The Applicant proposes an addition to the existing historic storefront buildings located at 368 and 364 Auburn Ave. on the eastern portion of the project site fronting Auburn Ave. A portion of the addition will be

to the rooftop of the historic structure and will consist of a two-story residential component. Staff finds that the proposed height of this addition meets the compatibility rule and has no concerns with the overall building massing with one exception.

As designed, Staff finds that the balconied front façade above the historic storefronts dominate the street view and would detract from the historic storefronts below. While the front façade of the addition is set back approximately 6' from the historic storefront façade, the proposed balcony on the third-floor space would close this gap, therefore negating the setback of the addition façade.

Staff finds that moving the front façade of the addition and making the balconies subtler would alleviate the issues of competition between the addition and the historic structure. As such, Staff recommends the front façade of the addition at 368 and 364 Auburn Ave. be set back 12' from the front façade/mansard roofs of the historic storefront. Staff further recommends that the third floor balcony of 368 and 364 Auburn Ave. be simplified and recessed so as to appear to be a cutout portion of the addition's front façade.

Regarding the materials and façade composition of the proposed addition, Staff has a few concerns. When reviewing additions and new construction in historic districts, Staff finds that two options for contemporary but compatible projects exist. The first method is to use historically compatible materials arranged in a contemporary way. The second method is to use contemporary materials but arrange them in a historically compatible way. Staff finds that the proposed addition uses contemporary materials arranged in a contemporary way. As such, Staff would recommend that the windows on 368 and 364 Auburn Ave. conform to the fenestration pattern of upper story windows on historic multi-story commercial buildings on the block and immediate surroundings.

New Construction

On the western portion of the project site, the Applicant is proposing a new structure at 348 Auburn Ave. and 349 Old Wheat St. that will front on Auburn Ave, Old Wheat St., and Hilliard St. In looking at the height of the proposed structure, it appears that the main portions of the building would conform to the maximum allowable height, but several rooftop structures are also proposed which would be taller than the height allowed by the zoning ordinance.

Rooftop structures which are used for rooftop access only are permitted to be taller than what the zoning ordinance allows, but the site plan shows several bathroom and storage spaces proposed in addition to the rooftop access spaces. As such, Staff finds that these spaces would not be permitted. Staff recommends that the rooftop structures on the new construction structure at 348 Auburn Ave. and 349 Old Wheat St. which are not associated with rooftop access via elevators or stairs be removed from the plans.

On the Auburn Ave. façade, a main entryway is proposed that would span two stories and would connect to an interior pedestrian arcade that would span the entirety of the project. Staff has concerns with some design aspects of the opening and with the materials used. The outline of the opening is banded with dark colored masonry, which draws the eye to that point of the structure. Given the close proximity to historic structures, Staff has concerns this design would detract from the prominence of those buildings on the block face. Staff would recommend a metal product, similar to the proposed canopy, be used to line the inside of the two story pedestrian arcade opening at 348 Auburn Ave., and that the outline of the opening be reduced. Staff would also recommend that the masonry pattern under the third story windows be consistent with the rest of the Auburn Ave. façade at 348 Auburn Ave. These changes would give the effect of the opening being "punched" into the façade to access the pedestrian arcade.

On the Wheat St. portion of the structure, Staff finds that the structure would exceed the allowable 45' in height. Staff recommends the height of the Wheat St. façade of the structure at 349 Old Wheat St. conform to the compatibility rule.

Per the District regulations, active uses are required along street frontages for the entirety of the building, except for garage entrances and exits. In looking at the Wheat St. façade, it appears that portions of the parking structure will encompass a large portion of the street level façade. Staff recommends the new structure at 348 Auburn Ave. and 349 Old Wheat St. meet the District's street level active use requirements and design requirements for parking structures.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to allow the Applicant time to address the following:

1. The Applicant shall provide information on the proposed lot configuration of the property and whether any consolidation of the lots is anticipated as part of this project;
2. Any window replacement on the historic storefront building located at 368 Auburn Ave. shall be reviewed and approved by Staff when replacement is deemed necessary by the project team, per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(b);
3. Mortar matching the consistency and color of the original shall be used for any repointing on the historic storefront building located at 368 Auburn Ave., per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(g);
4. Any window replacement on the Haugabrooks building located at 364 Auburn Ave. shall be reviewed and approved by Staff when replacement is deemed necessary by the project team, per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(b);
5. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the building materials and fenestration pattern of the comparable properties, per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(b);
6. The front façade of the addition for 368 and 364 Auburn Ave. shall be set back 12' from the front façade/mansard roofs of the historic storefront, per Sec. 16-20C.008(1)(b)(i);
7. The third-floor balcony on 368 and 364 Auburn Ave. shall be simplified and recessed so as to appear to be a cutout portion of the addition's front façade, per Sec. 16-20C.008(1)(a)(ii);
8. The windows on the historic storefront addition located at 368 and 364 Auburn Ave. shall conform to the fenestration pattern of upper story windows on historic multi-story commercial buildings on the block and immediate surroundings, per Sec. 16-20C.008(1)(a)(ii);
9. The rooftop structures on the new construction structure at 348 Auburn Ave. and 349 Old Wheat St. which are not associated with rooftop access via elevators or stairs shall be removed from the plans, per Sec. 16-20C.006(2)(a);
10. A metal product, similar to the proposed canopy, shall be used to line the inside of the two story pedestrian arcade opening at 348 Auburn Ave., and the outline of the opening shall be reduced per Sec. 16-20C.008(1)(a)(ii);
11. The masonry pattern under the third story windows shall be consistent with the rest of the Auburn Ave. façade at 348 Auburn Ave, per Sec. 16-20C.008(1)(a)(ii);
12. The height of the Wheat St. façade of the structure at 349 Old Wheat St. shall conform to the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20C.006(2)(a);
13. The new structure at 348 Auburn Ave. and 349 Old Wheat St. shall meet the District's street level active use requirements and design requirements for parking structures, per Sec. 16-20C.009(2); and,
14. Any updated plans and documents shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1056 Donnelly
APPLICATION: CA3-21-398
MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021, August 25, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: East of Lee Street and West of Lawton

Contributing (Y/N): Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 2019, an approval granted by the Commission with the for a 2019 proposal. The current Applicant will have to make sure anything that was not complied will need to be addressed. In January 2021, a compliant was issued because of the removal of the chimneys.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20, Chapter 20M of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

PURVIEW

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The Compatibility rule will govern this body of work and read as such “where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure. Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be compatible with that which predominates in such like contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.”

SCOPE OF WORK

Plans

The submitted elevations show a proposed side garage. The Applicant has since changed this proposal and has submitted a detached ADU which will include a garage to be installed in the rear of the property. Staff recommends on the final plans the proposal of the side garage be removed to show accurate elevations.

ADU ADDITION

The Applicant proposes to construct a 750-sf accessory dwelling. The site plan shows the accessory dwelling will meet required setbacks. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ALTERATIONS

Front Porch Elements

Photos provided by the Applicant reveal the railings has been installed incorrectly. Staff recommends the porch railings be a two-part head-butt construction that be no higher the bottom seal of the front window.

Chimneys

In 2019, on the first proposal of changes, two chimneys were presented on the house, one on the left and the other on the right elevations. The previous Applicant removed the two chimneys. While the Applicant has inherited the problem of replacing the chimneys, they must be replaced because they defining character on the house. Staff recommends, the Applicant reinstall the chimneys in their original locations to comply to the District regulations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The final plans shall eliminate the side garage on the proposed elevation, per Sec. 16-20M.001;
2. The railings shall be reinstalled as a two-part head butt construction with the railings being no higher than the front windowsill per Sec.16-20M. 013(2)(i);
3. The two chimneys shall be reinstalled to their original locations and have the original material of brick, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r)(11) and
4. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 649 Homes Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-21-389
MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021, deferred since September 8, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-5

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: West of Boulevard and East of Gress Avenue across from Rosedale

Contributing (Y/N)? No **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** New Construction

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION: Approval with Conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20I of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

Edits in RED

NEW CONSTRUCTION DEVELOPMENT

The Applicant proposes to construction a three-story duplex. Unit A being 2,204 sf and Unit B 2,367 sf.

Height

The proposed new construction is 35.5 ft. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Roof

The proposed roof line is gable front with a shed roof over the full porch with a hip extension that expands into a gable back. District regulations requires the front roof to be gabled or hipped. The shed roof is the primary roof over the porch. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL

Roof/Pitch

The proposed roof will consist of a front gable roof and corresponding gable roofs on the right, left and rear elevations with a connecting hip roof. District regulations requires roof forms be hip or gable. Additionally, the District regulations requires the pitch be no more than a minimum of 6/12. Staff is not concerned with either the roof or pitch proposals.

Materials

The Applicant proposes architectural shingles for the roof material Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Gutter

The Applicant proposes gutters to be installed. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Foundation

District regulations requires the first floor of a new construction to be built on a foundation and have at least a minimum of two entrance step which shall be no less than 6 inches in height. The Applicant has abided by the District regulations. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The proposed siding is 6-inches smooth face cementitious. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Foundation

Staff is not concerned with the proposed foundation.

Front porch

The Applicant proposes to construct one porch on the front elevation another on the right elevation. Both porches will have a gable roof with steps and risers with treads and 2x2 wood picket railings. In addition to complying with the District regulations, the proposed porches are consistent with stoop porch in the District. Staff does recommend the railing be a two-part head butt construction.

Doors

Both the front and side door are proposed to be a wood door with a full glass panel. This proposal does not concern Staff.

Side Doors

Windows

One over one wood windows with wood trim and no mullion or muntin are being proposed. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Fenestration

District regulations states that any facades that face a public street shall consist of a fenestration that is either: 1) substantially consistent with fenestrations on contributing structures or like uses in the District, or 2) shall be no less than 15 percent and not greater than 40 percent of total surface wall area. The fenestration patterns shown on the elevations illustrate a pattern that is not greater than 40 percent. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Deck and Balcony

The Applicant proposes one deck that sits at the rear of the unit and one balcony which will sit on the side of the unit. Both features are permitted and both proposals are in accordance with the District regulations. Staff is not concerned with the proposals.

Driveway

The proposed driveway is problematic for Staff. There are two issues. 1) The District regulations regarding driveway read as "if constructed, independent driveways within the front yard or half-depth front yard shall be a maximum of ten feet wide and shall have a maximum curb cut of ten feet, exclusive of the flare." The site plan shows a 15 foot wide driveway exclusive of the flare. Staff recommends the Applicant reduce the drive by 5 feet. Additionally, the extended drive with massive concrete appears to read as parking lot.

The Applicant has revised the site plan to show 10 feet wide driveway. While the massive concrete appears to read as a parking lot, there is nothing in the District regulations that prohibits the massive concrete.

Walkway

The District regulations requires walkways from the paved sidewalk to be installed. Staff does not see the walkway, the driveway is impeding this development. Staff recommends the Applicant install a walkway to comply to the District regulations.

The walkway will intersect the drive. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

1. The railing shall be a two-part head butt construction, per Sec. 16.20K.(001);
2. The porch stairs shall have two steps and have riser and be 6 inches in height, per Sec.16.20K and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant

CA3-21-389 for 649 Homes Ave
September 8, 2021
Page 4 of 4

Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 2957 Eleanor (variance)

APPLICATION: CA3-21-399

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1960

Property Location: East of Woodmere and West of Eleanor Court

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Ranch

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Porch railings

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior work

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work Order was placed on the house for painting masonry.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial

VARIANCE REQUEST

The Applicant has received a Stop Work Order on the property due to the Applicant painting unpainted masonry and the Applicant is requesting a variance to allow the paint to remain on the house. Painted unpainted masonry in historic districts in the City of Atlanta is prohibited. The Applicant has submitted the Variance application and has provided the answers to the following questions that must be considered before a variance is granted:

1) What are the extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular property?

The Applicant states **“There are none. As this is an aesthetic variance not driven by extraordinary and exceptional conditions this does not apply.”**

2) How will the Zoning Ordinance create an unnecessary hardship?

The Applicant writes, **“The current style of the home is one of the key drivers for the ultimate purchase decision. To remove the paint with no knowledge of the condition or color of the brick directly impacts that decision. Additionally, the ordinance only allowed two weeks to remove paint from a two-story home which is not nearly enough time to budget for an impromptu project of this cost and size, especially considering the extenuating circumstance of a global pandemic impacting the ability to find a service provider.”**

3) What conditions are peculiar to the property? The Applicant writes, **“Again, as this is an aesthetic variance not driven by extraordinary and exceptional conditions this does not apply. As I did not paint the brick, I cannot speak to why it was painted, but it does not remedy anything caused by a peculiarity of the property.”**

4) If relief is granted, would it cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair intent of Zoning? The Applicant answers, **“The painting of this structure does not cause any detriment to the public good, nor does it impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta. It is one of many painted homes, schools, churches, and commercial properties in Collier Heights. Collier Heights is one of the largest, if not the largest Historic District in the City of Atlanta. At 1,000 acres it is larger than our three largest parks combined and includes 1,700 homes and 54 subdivisions of varying architectural and aesthetic styles. Out of the 22 Historic Districts listed in city ordinances it is one of 9 that have blanket regulations applying to all buildings. Of that subset, the largest district (Sunset Avenue Historic District) is only 35 acres and comprised predominately of commercial buildings while some are entirely commercial property. The state of Georgia also designated this area as “Hardest Hit” by the housing crash in 2008 and has created programs to attract new owners occupants to the area to supply affordable housing and fill the many empty structures. As this home was built in 1960 it will need upgrades to remain viable and aesthetic.”**

STAFF RESPONSE

The Applicant’s rationale for not complying to the requirement to remove the paint from the unpainted masonry are not satisfactory answers for the requested questions. First, while the Applicant is correct, there is not an extraordinary or exceptional condition as to why the paint must remain on the masonry. The Applicant has not shown in any way that the brick in its makeup cannot have the paint removed when it should be removed. Second, while Staff does understand it is not the Applicant’s preference to remove the paint from the masonry and in fact was one of the reasons for the purchase of the house, that has nothing to do with a prevailing city-wide historic regulation that unpainted masonry must remain unpainted. The Collier Heights Historic District

alone with 8 other districts (according to the Applicant) are not the only ones with this “blanket” regulation. In fact, the opposite is true, there is only one District where unpainted masonry is permitted and that is conditioned on the type of paint being used. What the Applicant may or may not know is each District crafts their only specific regulations. So, if Collier Heights was the only one with a requirement that unpainted masonry remain unpainted that would be fine as well. Third, on face-value it may not appear this would be detrimental to the city ordinance; however, it is. Allowing people not to comply to what has been thought out and put in motion for compliance and then not requiring enforcement would undermine the rules and regulations. Lastly, the Applicant has stated that the ordinance will only allow for two weeks for remove is not accurate. The ordinance does not set a time for repairs or compliance. Perhaps, the Applicant is speaking on Code Enforcement requirements, which is a different process. But Staff is sure, Code Enforcement would allow for the appropriate time to remove the paint.

With all that stated above, Staff cannot support the variance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denied.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 492 West Kildare
APPLICATION: CA3-21-412 492 West Kildare
MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: West of Larchmont Circle and East of Larchmont Drive

Contributing (Y/N)? No, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Ranch/new construction

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior work

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

COMPATIBILITY

"In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face."

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Development and Setbacks

The Applicant proposes to construct a 1,769-sf single family house that will have a .10 FAR. Staff is not concerned with this, both meets the compatibility standard set by the District. The highest sf house is 2,136 and the lowest is 1,168 on the blockface. The highest FAR is .14 and the lowest is .07.

The proposed front setback is 57 feet and 3 inches. The furthest front setback on the blockface is 87 feet and the shortest is 33 feet. The front setback meets the compatibility standard. The side setbacks are 8 feet and 5 inches and 9 feet and 7 inches. Each meets the compatibility standard with the lowest setback on the blockface, 3 feet and the highest 49feet. Staff is not concerned with any of the development of the proposed house or its' setbacks.

Height, Roofline, Roof form, Pitch

District regulation requires the height of the first floor above the grade as measured at the front façade. The blockface range from 1 foot and 3 feet and 6 inches. The proposed is 1 foot and 9 inches. Roof heights range from the lowest of 13 feet and 4 inches to the highest 23 feet and 7 inches. The proposed height is 15 feet 6 inches. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The proposed roof form is a gable roof with a 4/12 pitch. From the compatibility information for the blockface, the predominated roof form is a gable roof with a 4/12 pitch. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Staff is not concerned with the massing; the proposed house is in line with the houses on the blockface.

Windows and Doors

The Applicant has proposed single-hung wood windows. The predominate window on the blockface is single hung. The Applicant has indicated material of the windows on the block is wood and aluminum. Houses constructed during the inception of the area would have had wood or aluminum. Staff is not concerned with the window proposal.

The Applicant has not provided the specific type of door proposed. Staff recommends the Applicant install a door that is predominate on the blockface.

Siding

The proposed siding is brick. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Garage

The proposed garage is side facing. District regulation requires new garages to comply to the compatibility standard. The predominate orientation of garages on the blockface is sidefacing. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Deck

The proposed deck is at the rear of the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Driveway

The Applicant proposes a 10-width driveway. District regulations states, “new driveways shall not exceed a width of ten feet between the principal structure and any public street except for the minimum flare required to allow access to double-width carports or garages.” Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20I of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall install a door that is predominate on the blockface per, Sec.16-20Q 001 and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 489 West Kildare

APPLICATION: CA3-21-413

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: West of Larchmont Circle and East of Larchmont Drive

Contributing (Y/N)? No, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Ranch/new construction

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior work

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

COMPATIBILITY

"In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face."

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Development and Setbacks

The Applicant proposes to construct an 1,890-sf single family house that will have a .14 FAR. Staff is not concerned with this proposal, both meets the compatibility standard set by the District. The highest sf house is 2,808 and the lowest is 1,418 on the blockface. The highest FAR is .17 and the lowest is .11.

The proposed front setback is 35 feet. The furthest front setback on the blockface is 38 feet and the shortest is 34 feet. The front setback meets the compatibility standard. The proposed side setbacks are 7 feet and 1 inch and 7 feet and 3 inches. Each meets the compatibility standard with the lowest setback on the blockface, 2 feet and the highest 62 feet. Staff is not concerned with any of the development of the proposed house or its' setbacks.

Height, Roofline, Roof form, Pitch and massing

District regulation requires the height of the first floor above the grade as measured at the front façade. The blockface range from 1 feet and 6 inches and 4 feet and 6 inches. The proposed is 1 foot and 10 inches. Roof heights range from the lowest of 15 feet and 4 inches to the highest 21 feet. The proposed height is 14 feet 5 inches. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The proposed roof form is a gable roof with a 4/12 pitch. From the compatibility information for the blockface, the predominated roof form is a gable roof with a 4/12 pitch. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Staff is not concerned with the massing; the proposed house is in line with the houses on the blockface.

Windows and Doors

The Applicant has proposed single-hung wood windows. The predominate window on the blockface is single hung. The Applicant has indicated the material of the windows on the block is wood and aluminum. Houses constructed during the inception of the area would have had wood or aluminum. Staff is not concerned with the window proposal.

The Applicant has not provided the specific type of door proposed. Staff recommends the Applicant install a door that is predominate on the blockface.

Siding

The proposed siding is brick and board and batten in the gable. Information provided by the Applicant shows the predominate siding material is brick and board and batten is not a recommended material. Staff recommends the Applicant install brick and not board and batten.

Garage

The proposes garage is front facing. District regulation requires new garages to comply to the compatibility standard. The predominate orientation of garages on the blockface is front facing. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Deck

The proposed deck is at the rear of the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Driveway

The Applicant proposes a 10-width driveway. District regulations states, “new driveways shall not exceed a width of ten feet between the principal structure and any public street except for the minimum flare required to allow access to double-width carports or garages.” Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20I of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall install a door that is predominate on the blockface per, Sec.16-20Q 001;
2. The siding material shall be brick to meet the District regulations, per Sec.16-20Q.001 and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 481 West Kildare

APPLICATION: CA3-21-414

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: West of Larchmont Circle and East of Larchmont Drive

Contributing (Y/N)? No, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Ranch/new construction

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior work

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

COMPATIBILITY

"In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face."

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Development and Setbacks

The Applicant proposes to construct an 1,846-sf single family house that will have a .14 FAR. Staff is not concerned with this proposal, both meets the compatibility standard set by the District. The highest sf house is 2,808 and the lowest is 1,418 on the blockface. The highest FAR is .17 and the lowest is .11.

The proposed front setback is 35 feet. The furthest front setback on the blockface is 38 feet and the shortest is 34 feet. The front setback meets the compatibility standard. The proposed side setbacks are 11 feet and 10 inch and 8 feet and 1 inches. Each meets the compatibility standard with the lowest setback on the blockface, 2 feet and the highest 62 feet. Staff is not concerned with any of the development of the proposed house or its' setbacks.

Height, Roofline, Roof form, Pitch and massing

District regulation requires the height of the first floor above the grade as measured at the front façade. The blockface range from 1 feet and 6 inches and 4 feet and 6 inches. The proposed is 1 foot and 10 inches. Roof heights range from the lowest of 15 feet and 4 inches to the highest 21 feet. The proposed height is 15 feet 7 inches. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The proposed roof form is a gable roof with a 4/12 pitch. From the compatibility information for the blockface, the predominated roof form is a gable roof with a 4/12 pitch. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Staff is not concerned with the massing; the proposed house is in line with the houses on the blockface.

Windows and Doors

The Applicant has proposed single-hung wood windows. The predominate window on the blockface is single hung. The Applicant has indicated the material of the windows on the block is wood and aluminum. Houses constructed during the inception of the area would have had wood or aluminum. Staff is not concerned with the window proposal.

The Applicant has not provided the specific type of door proposed. Staff recommends the Applicant install a door that is predominate on the blockface.

Siding

The proposed siding is brick and board and batten in the gable. Information provided by the Applicant shows the predominate siding material is brick and board and batten is not a recommended material. Staff recommends the Applicant install brick and not board and batten.

Garage

The proposes garage is front facing. District regulation requires new garages to comply to the compatibility standard. The predominate orientation of garages on the blockface is front facing. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Deck

The proposed deck is at the rear of the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Driveway

The Applicant proposes a 10-width driveway. District regulations states, “new driveways shall not exceed a width of ten feet between the principal structure and any public street except for the minimum flare required to allow access to double-width carports or garages.” Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20I of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall install a door that is predominate on the blockface per, Sec.16-20Q 001;
2. The siding material shall be brick to meet the District regulations, per Sec.16-20Q.001 and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 473 West Kildare

APPLICATION: CA3-21-415

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: West of Larchmont Circle and East of Larchmont Drive

Contributing (Y/N)? No, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Ranch/new construction

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior work

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

COMPATIBILITY

"In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face."

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Development and Setbacks

The Applicant proposes to construct an 1,890-sf single family house that will have a .13 FAR. Staff is not concerned with this proposal, both meets the compatibility standard set by the District. The highest sf house is 2,808 and the lowest is 1,418 on the blockface. The highest FAR is .17 and the lowest is .11.

The proposed front setback is 35 feet. The furthest front setback on the blockface is 38 feet and the shortest is 34 feet. The front setback meets the compatibility standard. The proposed side setbacks are 9 feet and 1 inch and 9 feet and 1 inches. Each meets the compatibility standard with the lowest setback on the blockface, 2 feet and the highest 62 feet. Staff is not concerned with any of the development of the proposed house or its' setbacks.

Height, Roofline, Roof form, Pitch and massing

District regulation requires the height of the first floor above the grade as measured at the front façade. The blockface range from 1 feet and 6 inches and 4 feet and 6 inches. The proposed is 1 foot and 10 inches. Roof heights range from the lowest of 15 feet and 4 inches to the highest 21 feet. The proposed height is 16 feet 3 inches. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The proposed roof form is a gable roof with a 4/12 pitch. From the compatibility information for the blockface, the predominated roof form is a gable roof with a 4/12 pitch. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Staff is not concerned with the massing; the proposed house is in line with the houses on the blockface.

Windows and Doors

The Applicant has proposed single-hung wood windows. The predominate window on the blockface is single hung. The Applicant has indicated the material of the windows on the block is wood and aluminum. Houses constructed during the inception of the area would have had wood or aluminum. Staff is not concerned with the window proposal.

The Applicant has not provided the specific type of door proposed. Staff recommends the Applicant install a door that is predominate on the blockface.

Siding

The proposed siding is brick and board and batten in the gable. Information provided by the Applicant shows the predominate siding material is brick and board and batten is not a recommended material. Staff recommends the Applicant install brick and not board and batten.

Garage

The proposes garage is front facing. District regulation requires new garages to comply to the compatibility standard. The predominate orientation of garages on the blockface is front facing. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Deck

The proposed deck is at the rear of the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Driveway

The Applicant proposes a 10-width driveway. District regulations states, “new driveways shall not exceed a width of ten feet between the principal structure and any public street except for the minimum flare required to allow access to double-width carports or garages.” Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20I of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall install a door that is predominate on the blockface per, Sec.16-20Q 001;
2. The siding material shall be brick to meet the District regulations, per Sec.16-20Q.001 and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 473 West Kildare

APPLICATION: CA3-21-415

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: West of Larchmont Circle and East of Larchmont Drive

Contributing (Y/N)? No, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Ranch/new construction

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior work

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

COMPATIBILITY

"In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face."

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Development and Setbacks

The Applicant proposes to construct an 1,846-sf single family house that will have a .13 FAR. Staff is not concerned with this proposal, both meets the compatibility standard set by the District. The highest sf house is 2,808 and the lowest is 1,418 on the blockface. The highest FAR is .17 and the lowest is .11.

The proposed front setback is 35 feet. The furthest front setback on the blockface is 38 feet and the shortest is 34 feet. The front setback meets the compatibility standard. The proposed side setbacks are 8 feet and 9 inch and 8 feet and 9 inches. Each meets the compatibility standard with the lowest setback on the blockface, 2 feet and the highest 62 feet. Staff is not concerned with any of the development of the proposed house or its' setbacks.

Height, Roofline, Roof form, Pitch and massing

District regulation requires the height of the first floor above the grade as measured at the front façade. The blockface range from 1 feet and 6 inches and 4 feet and 6 inches. The proposed is 1 foot and 10 inches. Roof heights range from the lowest of 15 feet and 4 inches to the highest 21 feet. The proposed height is 15 feet 7 inches. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The proposed roof form is a gable roof with a 4/12 pitch. From the compatibility information for the blockface, the predominated roof form is a gable roof with a 4/12 pitch. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Staff is not concerned with the massing; the proposed house is in line with the houses on the blockface.

Windows and Doors

The Applicant has proposed single-hung wood windows. The predominate window on the blockface is single hung. The Applicant has indicated the material of the windows on the block is wood and aluminum. Houses constructed during the inception of the area would have had wood or aluminum. Staff is not concerned with the window proposal.

The Applicant has not provided the specific type of door proposed. Staff recommends the Applicant install a door that is predominate on the blockface.

Siding

The proposed siding is brick and board and batten in the gable. Information provided by the Applicant shows the predominate siding material is brick and board and batten is not a recommended material. Staff recommends the Applicant install brick and not board and batten.

Garage

The proposes garage is front facing. District regulation requires new garages to comply to the compatibility standard. The predominate orientation of garages on the blockface is front facing. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Deck

The proposed deck is at the rear of the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Driveway

The Applicant proposes a 10-width driveway. District regulations states, “new driveways shall not exceed a width of ten feet between the principal structure and any public street except for the minimum flare required to allow access to double-width carports or garages.” Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20I of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall install a door that is predominate on the blockface per, Sec.16-20Q 001;
2. The siding material shall be brick to meet the District regulations, per Sec.16-20Q.001 and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1056 Donnelly
APPLICATION: CA3-21-417 (Special Exception)
MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021, August 25, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: East of Lee Street and West of Lawton

Contributing (Y/N): Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:**

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Special Exception

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N): Yes

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 2019, an approval granted by the Commission with the listed conditions below. The current Applicant will have to make sure those conditions are met. In January 2021, a compliant was issued because of the removal of the chimney.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approved

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20, Chapter 20M of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION

The Applicant has petition for a Special Exception to construct an 8 feet fence instead of the required 6 feet fence. The following questions must be addressed and has been answered by the Applicant:

- 1) Justification of Request (Security of Privacy) and will not unduly prevent passage of light and air to adjoining properties and not incompatible with the character of the neighborhood.
The Applicant states, "I have police reports and pictures of people breaking in home & men traveling thru backyard with hoodies on."
- 2) Greater Height is justified for security of persons or property in the area.
The Applicant states, "Yes, I have people hanging out in my backyard drinking & sleeping on my back step."
- 3) Topographic reasons for such greater
The Applicant states, "Yes, on the right side of the yard the grade drops 3 to 4 feet, I need to start the fence behind the trees."

STAFF RESPONSE

The Applicant proposes the 8 feet fence be installed from the right side with a gate connection at the corner of the house that will run down the side, back on the left and connect to the other corner of the house. The Applicant has reported several intruders on the property since purchase. The house at one time laid dormant so such vacancy was welcome and now stopping this foot traffic is almost impossible with a fence. With the Applicant heighten fear of break-ins because of attempted breaks in the neighborhood and with someone sleeping on her property, it is reasonable to see why she is requested 8 feet fence. The 8 feet is a guarantee that no one could easily scale the fence. Most importantly, the construction of the proposed 8 feet fence would not impede any neighbors from air or light. The topography of the property does not place the Applicant's so close to neighboring properties. And the 3 to 4 feet drops on the right side will make the fence appear shorter.

The Applicant has successfully stated a justifiable reason for the 8 feet request. Staff supports the request.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 870 Lullwater Rd.
APPLICATION: CA3-21-422
MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Druid Hills Landmark District

Other Zoning: N/A

Date of Construction: 1914

Property Location: West block face of Lullwater Rd. north of the Ponce De Leon Ave Intersection. .

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Exhibits characteristics of Tudor Revival Style.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations, Addition, and Site Work.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20B

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20B of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The District regulations contain both qualitative and quantitative requirements relating to alterations, additions, and the construction of new accessory structures. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the project element met the District regulations.

Addition

The Applicant is proposing a metal solarium addition to the rear of the structure. In general, Staff finds the design of the project to be consistent with similar structures from the time period. Given that the addition will not be visible from the public right of way and that it will be clearly identifiable as a non-historic element, Staff has no concerns with the proposal.

Alterations

In addition to the proposed changes to the rear of the structure to accommodate the new addition, the Applicant proposes the re-installation of casement windows on the second floor of the structure. From the photographs it appears that these windows were removed at some point in the past, as their outline is still extant. Staff has no general concerns with the alteration, but recommends the Applicant provide information documenting the historic nature of the existing casement sashes. Staff further recommends that any historic casement sashes be retained and re-used in their original location.

Site work

The Applicant is proposing a new pool and pool pavilion in the rear yard. Staff finds that these structures meet the setback requirements and are secondary in design to the principal structure. As such, Staff has no concerns with these items.

The Applicant is proposing to repair the existing walkway, replace the existing front retaining wall, and replace the existing driveway. Staff finds that the work is consistent with the existing features and that the materials will be compatible with the historic materials. Staff would recommend that the walkway brick be retained and re-used as part of the repairs. Staff would further recommend that the proposed cobblestone driveway apron be re-designed to include a continuation of the concrete sidewalk.

On the north portion of the side yard, the Applicant is proposing a parking court which comes within 20' of the side lot line. The District regulations prohibit off street parking spaces within 20' of any lot line. As such, Staff recommends the proposed parking court be changed to meet the District regulations.

The existing and proposed lot coverage is not noted on the plans. Staff recommends that the lot coverage meet the District regulations and that the existing and proposed lot coverage be noted on the plans.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall provide information documenting the historic nature of the existing casement sashes, per Sec. 16-20.003(1)(b);
2. Any historic casement sashes shall be retained and re-used in their original location, per Sec. 16-20.003(1)(b);
3. The walkway brick shall be retained and re-used as part of the repairs, per Sec. 16-20.003(1)(b);
4. The proposed cobblestone driveway apron shall be re-designed to include a continuation of the concrete sidewalk;
5. The proposed parking court shall be changed to meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20.003(3)(a);
6. The lot coverage shall meet the District regulations and that the existing and proposed lot coverage be noted on the plans, per Sec. 16-20.006(4); and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 560 Edgewood Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-21-423

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther King, Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 4 & 2) **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: North block face of Edgewood Ave. and south block face of Auburn Ave., east of the Howell St. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Industrial

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations, rear addition, site work.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20C

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Commission previously reviewed and approved application CA2-19-300 for an addition and alterations at this property. The current proposal has done away with the previous plans and is therefore not related to the previous design or approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20C of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Alterations to the historic structure

The Applicant is proposing several alterations to the front and side of the existing structure. First, the Applicant is proposing the replacement of the existing non-historic windows and doors. Staff has no concerns with this proposal. However, Staff would note that the right-side façade of the structure shows the windows being enlarged. Staff has not received information showing whether the existing openings on this portion of the structure are original. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing whether the openings on the side facades of the structure are original.

The Applicant is proposing the removal of the existing pedestrian entrance and replacing it with windows matching the style of the new windows on the front façade. Staff has no concerns with the material or entry change, but recommends the existing awning be retained to mark the original entrance to the structure.

On the right side of the front façade, the Applicant is proposing a new two-story entryway storefront. The Applicant is also proposing metal cladding be added to the parapet of the structure to increase the height. While Staff is not concerned with this portion of the structure being reconfigured as the main entrance, Staff does have concerns with the loss of historic materials that the two-story storefront would cause. While the addition is not an original portion of the structure, it does show the pattern of development on the site over time. As such, Staff recommends the main entrance only contain a single-story storefront unit. Staff further recommends the metal cladding be removed from the front and side façade of the existing wing addition.

New addition

The Applicant is proposing a new addition to the rear of the existing structure. As the addition is not visible from the public right of way, and as the design of the structure is compatible with the industrial nature of the principal structure, Staff has no concerns with the design of the addition.

Site Work

On the western portion of the Edgewood Ave. frontage, the Applicant is proposing a new dog park. Staff has no general concerns other than the location of the fencing around the proposed dog park. Per the subarea 3-4 regulations, fences are prohibited along street frontages. Because of this, a variance to allow the fencing would be required before the dog park could be approved. Staff recommends the Applicant apply for a variance to allow a fence along the street frontage for the proposed dog park.

Along the Edgewood Ave. frontage, the Applicant is proposing several alterations for the ingress/egress of the site. As the ingress/egress is an existing condition, Staff finds that the continuation of this portion of the property for access is appropriate. However, Staff is concerned that the specific design currently under review would both negatively impact the surrounding residential uses in subarea 2 and would not meet specific requirements of the District regulations.

Regarding the proposed two-way driveway, Staff finds that the extension of the driveway to the full width of the curb cut would be inappropriate. To lessen the impact of the ingress and egress on the Auburn Ave. block, Staff recommends the two-way driveway on the Auburn Ave. frontage be reduced to 24' for its entire length. Staff further recommends the single lane egress drive on the Auburn Ave. frontage be reduced to the minimum width allowable.

The site plan shows the dumpsters being located between the parking structure and Auburn Ave. The district

regulations prohibit dumpsters between the principal building and any public street. As such, Staff recommends the dumpster be located elsewhere on the site in a location permitted by the District regulations or in the parking structure via a rolling dumpster.

Lastly, Staff recommends that evergreen plantings be added to the Auburn Ave. frontage and along the property lines bordering residential properties to lessen the impact of the work on the neighboring residential uses.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to allow the Applicant time to address the following:

1. The Applicant shall provide information detailing whether the openings on the side facades of the structure are original, per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(b);
2. The existing awning shall be retained to mark the original entrance to the structure, per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(b);
3. The main entrance shall only contain a single-story storefront unit 1, per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(a);
4. The metal cladding shall be removed from the front and side façade of the existing wing addition, per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(b);
5. The Applicant shall apply for a variance to allow a fence along the street frontage for the proposed dog park 1, per Sec. 16-20C.008(3)(c)(ii);
6. The two-way driveway on the Auburn Ave. frontage shall be reduced to 24' for its entire length, per Sec. 16-20c.009(3);
7. The single lane egress driveway on the Auburn Ave. shall be reduced to the minimum width allowable, per Sec. 16-20c.009(3);
8. The dumpster shall be located elsewhere on the site in a location permitted by the District regulations or in the parking structure via a rolling dumpster, per Sec. 16-20C.008(d)(i);
9. Evergreen plantings shall be added to the Auburn Ave. frontage and along the property lines bordering residential properties to lessen the impact of the work on the neighboring residential uses, per Sec. 16-20C.008(c)(i); and,
10. All updated plans and documentation shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 354 Woodward Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-21-424

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** SPI-22 (SA4) / Beltline.

Date of Construction: Not listed in the District inventory / early 1990s.

Property Location: North blockface of Woodward Ave., west of Oakland Drive, east of Grant Street

Contributing (Y/N)?: No **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** NA

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Front façade alterations and financial hardship exemption

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Side and rear façade alterations.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Unpermitted work and conditional approval via CA2-21-356.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Section Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20K of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Application of regulations

The District regulations only give the Commission purview over those façades of the structure which directly face a public street. As the subject property is an “interior lot” (i.e. not on a corner), the Staff will limit their commentary to only the Woodward Ave. façade.

The District regulations provide the following criteria, with two options within it, for reviewing alterations to non-contributing structures such as the subject property.

“Alterations to non-contributing structures, for which a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be required, shall be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the existing structure or shall comply with the applicable regulations for new construction set forth in subsection 16-20K.007(2)(B) above.”

Further, the pertinent new construction guidelines related to facades is as follows:

B) Design Standards and Criteria for New Principal Structures.

- 1. Identified design elements of size, scale, massing and materials of new construction shall be substantially consistent with said identified design elements found in contributing structures of like use in the district as listed in subsection 16-20K.007(15)(c.).*
- 15. On those façades of any structure that face a public street, the following regulations on building materials shall apply. Alternate materials may be submitted for review by the commission.*
 - c. Siding/veneer: Horizontal lap siding, vinyl siding, aluminum siding, shingles, brick, hard stucco, and stone shall be permitted. Stacked stone is prohibited.*

At its August 11, 2021 public hearing, the Commission approved with conditions (via CA2-21-356) miscellaneous repairs to the front porch columns, flooring, and railing (noted in the scope of work submitted to the Staff and Commission), but required the replacement of the rest of the vertical board and batten material on the front façade, as follows:

1. The board and batten sheathing on the front façade shall be removed and shall be replaced with the same cementitious siding, in the same design, used on the remainder of the front façade, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(B)(1) and (15) and .007(2)(C); and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

The Staff would note that the board and batten material on the side and rear façade can remain because the side and rear facades of a house on a non-corner lot are not subject to the District regulations and thus not subject to review by the Commission. The only portion of the project pertinent to this analysis is the board and batten sheathing on the front façade itself.

In the Applicant’s submitted materials, regarding project costs, they note the total project cost (\$37,000), the cost to remove the board and batten from the front façade (\$3,000), and the cost to remove the board and batten from the entire house (\$11,000). This last cost is not pertinent to this

analysis as the Applicant is not required to remove any work (board and batten or otherwise) from the side or rear façade due to the District regulations. The cost to remove the board and batten from the front façade would add about 8% to the total project cost - \$37,000 to \$40,000 – according to the Applicant.

They also note their yearly income (\$46,768, which is presumably \$3,897 per month) and their line of credit limit (\$25,000) they are using to help finance the project.

The Staff finds that while the added cost to comply with the District regulations is marginal to the overall project cost, it acknowledges that it is a high percentage of their presumed monthly income. At the time, the timetable to paying off that added cost is not immediate, given the line of credit that is being used for the project.

While the house is non-contributing to the District (built in the 1990s), the work in question is on the front façade and would be a distinct deviation from the compatible, horizontal siding appearance that would be the standard (and required) treatment for the bulk of the exterior sheathing for either a contributing or non-contributing structure.

In conclusion the Staff finds that while adherence to the District regulations through removal of the board and batten sheathing on the front façade would increase the project cost, that marginal increase in project cost is outweighed by the need for compliance with the District regulations given the prominence of the house element (front façade siding) in question.

The Staff would recommend denial of the financial hardship request.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 950 Austin Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-21-426

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-5 / Beltline.

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: North block face of Austin Ave., east of the Elizabeth Ave. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Pyramid roof cottage.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variances

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Design of proposed accessory structure.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20I

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the June 9, 2021, public hearing the Commission reviewed and approved the application CA3-21-253 for the consolidation of 2 lots into 1 lot at this address.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20I of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Variances

The requested variances are to allow parking between Atlantis Ave. and the principal structure where otherwise prohibited, to allow an increase in the allowable driveway width from a maximum of 10'; to 16' 6" proposed, and to allow an accessory structure between the principal structure and Atlantis Ave. where otherwise prohibited.

There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape or topography:

The Applicant cites the double frontage nature of the lot and the use of Atlantis Ave. as a secondary frontage by neighboring properties. The Applicant also cites several existing non-conformities present with the site. Additionally, the Applicant cites 20' sewer easements that run through the site that further restrict development.

The application of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship:

The Applicant states that due to the double frontage of the lot, it would not be possible to construct a compliant accessory structure on the lot.

Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved:

The Applicant states that double frontage lots are limited to only a few blocks in the District. The Applicant also states that the existence of three sewer lines beneath a property only exists on the subject property and a few adjacent lots.

Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant states that since all of the proposed uses the variances would allow to be constructed are otherwise permitted, and since the location of accessory structures on Atlantis Ave. is consistent with the historic pattern of structures, that the proposed work would not impair the purposes and intent of the District regulations. The Applicant also cites the issuance of variances for properties in the district with similar lot constraints from 2010-2017.

Staff finds that the Applicant's responses satisfy the requirements of the variance criteria. The Applicant has demonstrated how the site constraints, as well as the double frontage nature of the site, limit the development of the property as would otherwise be permitted by right. Staff would further note that the distance of the structure from Atlantis Ave, which would be more than the compatibility rule would require, further constricts the ability to construct a driveway that is fully compliant with the regulations. As such, Staff supports the requested variances.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1565 Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. (Mozley Park)

APPLICATION: RC-21-420

MEETING DATE: September 22, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** R-4.

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: North block face of Martin Luther King Jr. Dr, east of W. Lake Dr.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: N/A

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site Work

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments.

RC-21-420 for 1565 MLK, Jr. Dr. (Mozley Park)

September 22, 2021

Page 2 of 2

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant is proposing the installation of a new dog park. Infrastructure to be installed includes fencing, water fountains, and play equipment. In general Staff has no concerns with the proposal and finds the design appropriate for the selected location.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File